UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/540,427	06/23/2005	Long Fei Chang	1-36758	4198	
	7590 07/24/200 MENS MARTIN & MI	EXAMINER			
28366 KENSINGTON LANE			GUILL, RUSSELL L		
PERRYSBURG, OH 43551		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			2123		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			07/24/2008	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

miller@fraser-ip.com sloan@fraser-ip.com crooks@fraser-ip.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/540,427	CHANG ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Russ Guill	2123	

	Russ Guill	2123	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>09 May 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of the period of extensions of the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions.	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth inter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE). on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.13 ension and the corresponding amount of the position of the corresponding amount of the correspond	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII 36(a) and the appropriate of the fee. The appropria	n. LED WITHIN TWO e extension fee ate extension fee
under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL			
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bette appeal; and/or	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	ΓE below);	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1.1)	16 and 41.33(a)).		
 4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [·	•	_
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		i pe entereu anu arre.	cpianation of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
 AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a).
10.		•	
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	,	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Paul L Rodriguez/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2123			

Continuation of 3. NOTE:

Amendments change the scope of the claims, and thus require further search and consideration. Please see the request for reconsideration below..

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The Examiner would like to thank the Applicant for the well prepared amendment, which was useful in the examination process.

The Examiner suggests amending the independent claims to more specifically recite the unique features of the Applicant's invention.

- 1. Regarding the objection to the specification:
- a. Applicant's amendments appear to overcome the objection.
- 2. Regarding claim 10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph:
- a. Applicant's claim amendment may overcome the rejection; however, it appears to cause a new rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Further search and consideration is required.
- 3. Regarding claim 11 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph:
- a. Applicant's claim amendment tentatively appears to overcome the rejection; however, further search and consideration are required.
- 4. Regarding claims 1 and 17 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103:
- a. Applicant's arguments are not persuasive, as discussed below.
- b. Page 12, lines 3 5 and lines 22 24, recites that the specification defines the primary and secondary heating sources as "lamp wattage, lamp power settings, overall power, reflection coefficients, initial perform temperature, ceramic coating . . .". The Examiner respectfully disagrees, as follows. These recited items appear to be described in the specification as "heating parameters", rather than primary and secondary heating sources. The specification appears to recite secondary heating sources as "temperatures of a backplate and reflectors". The primary radiation sources appear to be lamps.
- c. The Applicant discusses on page 13 that Turner does not disclose providing heating information about and calculation of temperatures of the primary and secondary heating sources. The Examiner respectfully disagrees, as discussed below. First, the claim appears to only require heating information, rather than heating information about primary and secondary heating sources. Further, heating information is provided by Reeves, rather than Turner. Further, while Turner recites that some secondary effects such as scattering, birefringence and polarization are neglected, the Applicant admits that Turner does treat the metallic reflectors, which are defined in the Applicant's specification as secondary heating sources (see above). Further, Turner's calculations include the quartz envelope, which is also secondary heating source; see for example page 11, right-side column, last paragraph, "Equation (28) applies to filaments and quartz envelopes alike . . . ", where equation (28) provides an equation that calculates source temperatures. This element alone would have reasonably suggested to the ordinary artisan the limitation of, "calculating temperatures of primary and secondary heating sources". Thus, the rejection is maintained.
- d. Proper motivation to combine the references is recited in the rejection.
- 5. Regarding claims 15 and 16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103:
- a. Claims 15 and 16 were argued similar to claims 1 and 17 above. The Examiner's response is therefore the same as above.
- 6. Regarding claim 22 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103:
- a. Claim 22 was argued similar to claims 1 and 17 above. The Examiner's response is therefore the same as above.